



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,716	09/26/2001	Joshua A. Norrid	AUS920010667US1	9290
45993 7590 06/22/2009 IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123				
EXAMINER				
KARMIS, STEFANOS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3693				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/22/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/963,716

Applicant(s)

NORRID, JOSHUA A.

Examiner

STEFANOS KARMIS

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19, and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/02)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in reply to the remarks filed 12 March 2009.

Status of Claims

2. Claim 1 is currently amended. Claims 1-5, 19 and 20 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12 March 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1, refer to previous arguments in the prosecution history. While those previous responses contain arguments addressed at the references individually, none of the previous arguments were in response to the specific rejection of Mankes, in view of Chen, in further view of Pugliese. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant must discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. The arguments submitted 12 March 2009, fail to explain how claim 1 is distinguished from Mankes, in view of Chen, in further view of Pugliese. Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.
5. Applicant's amendment to claim 1, is discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankes U.S. Patent 6,477,503 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) U.S. Patent 6,873,957 in view of in further view of Pugliese, III et al. (hereinafter Pugliese) U.S. Publication 2001/0016825 in further view of Gramann, III et al. (hereinafter Gramann) U.S. Publication No. 2001/0049613.

Regarding independent claim 1, Mankes teaches a method for establishing a reservation directly into a hotel Property Management System (see EOS; Figure 7). Mankes teaches providing a primary web server interfaced through a direct pathway to a hotel Property Management System via terminal emulation, said direct pathway excluding a Global Distribution System or a Central Reservation System (column 6, lines 4-60; Examiner notes that Mankes teaches that the ARS interfaces with the EOS and that the ARS replicates inventory from the EOS. Mankes does not use a CSR or GDS). Control of inventory is maintained by the EOS (Property Management System) (column 6, lines 61 thru column 7, line 10). Mankes teaches that different classes of users log on to the primary server using a password and can then make reservations through the ARS if it is determined that inventory is available (column 7, lines 47 thru column 8, line 2). Mankes further teaches that the classes of consumers are

consumers with special rates and commissions (column 5, lines 26-33) such as resellers (wholesalers/agents), known/unknown consumers (direct consumer) (column 5, lines 26-57 and column 8, lines 14-23).

Mankes further teaches that special inventory conditions based on consumer class and that such information is directly displayed to the consumer (column 7, lines 22-46) and that the various users access the ARS using a website (column 3, lines 20-56, column 5, lines 34-40 and column 6, lines 4-11). Mankes fails to teach providing three or more clone reservation sites to a primary reservation management site, each clone reservation site having a user interface tailored based on the user and responsive to a booking party attempting to book a reservation on said primary reservation management system, redirecting said booking party to one of said clone reservation sties to match said booking party to a tailored user interface according to the user.

Chen teaches a method for replicating websites for establishing a reservation. Specifically, Chen teaches providing three or more clone reservation sites to a primary reservation management site, each clone reservation site having a user interface tailored based on the user (column 3, line 59-67 and column 4, line 18-40 and column 4, lines 56-62 and Figure 3) and responsive to a booking party attempting to book a reservation on said primary reservation management system, redirecting said booking party to one of said clone reservation sties to match said booking party to a tailored user interface according to the user (column 3, line 59-67 and column 4, line 18-40 and column 4, lines 56-62 and Figure 3 and column 5, lines 5-12 and Figure 5). Chen teaches that the cloned sited include: availability of low fare ticket search; selection of database; desired security levels, availability of quick search and links to

tables that include: travel policies for the specific user, discounts available, preferred hotels, car rentals and instant ticketing commissions (column 3, lines 5-67 and column 5, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes for providing specific class information directly to the user using a password on a primary site with the clone website teaches of Chen because it provides for each class to have a more detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation.

Mankes in view of Chen fails to teach that the commissions and special rates (discounts) are recorded in a revenue pool. Pugliese teaches an electronic ticketing and reservation method that stores the fee accorded to the travel agent (paragraph 0040). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Chen to include the teachings of Pugliese because it provides for tracking and recording the commissions or revenues for classes of users.

Mankes in view of Chen in further view of Pugliese fails to teach periodically synchronizing clone inventory databases of said clone reservation sites with an inventory database of said primary reservation management web server. Gramann teaches a synchronizing reservation database (Abstract). Scheduling reservations comprises automatically and periodically synchronizing a primary database with a secondary database (paragraphs 0036-0040). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Chen in further view of Pugliese for teachings reservations using at least three clone sites and

disseminating inventory information with the teachings of Gramann for periodically synchronizing reservation databases because it provides for inventory information to be made available to the different sites and they synchronizing helps to reduce conflicts and lost information between users of the system making reservations.

Claim 2, Chen teaches wherein said step of directing a booking party to a clone reservation system according to a booking party type comprises a redirecting from a primary Universal Resource Locator to a clone Universal Resource Locator (column 4, lines 40-55). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Chen for directing a booking party from a primary URL to a cloned URL because it provides for the classes of users to have a detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation.

Claims 3 and 4, Chen teaches that the user is a registered user (column 5, lines 5-12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Chen for registering a user because it provides for the classes of users to have a detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation and can provide for remembering users without the need to re-enter substantial information.

Regarding claims 5, Chen teaches that the cloned sites include: availability of low fare ticket search; selection of database; desired security levels, availability of quick search and links to tables that include: travel policies for the specific user, discounts available, preferred hotels, car rentals and instant ticketing commissions (column 3, lines 5-67 and column 5, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Chen for directing a booking party from a primary URL to a cloned URL because it provides for the classes of users to have a detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation.

8. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankes U.S. Patent 6,477,503 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) U.S. Patent 6,873,957 in view of in further view of Pugliese, III et al. (hereinafter Pugliese) U.S. Publication 2001/0016825 in further view of Gramann, III et al. (hereinafter Gramann) U.S. Publication No. 2001/0049613 in further view of Devarajan et al. (hereinafter Devarajan) U.S. Patent 7,167,904.

Claims 19 and 20, Chen teaches wherein said redirecting of said booking party comprises a redirecting from a URL address to a clone URL address (column 4, lines 40-55). Mankes in view of Chen in view of Pugliese in further view of Gramann fails to teach that the redirection

is done from a primary domain to a clone subdomain. Devarajan teaches redirecting based on domain and subdomain as well as web address (column 3, lines 10 thru column 4, line 40). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Chen in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Devarajan because it provides for incorporating customer specific information when making a reservation.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEFANOS KARMIS whose telephone number is (571)272-6744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Respectfully Submitted
/Stefanos Karmis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693
22 June 2009